

[1st August 1933]

IV.—THE MADRAS MATERNITY BENEFIT BILL.

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"I beg to move for permission to introduce the Madras Maternity Benefit Bill."

Mr. T. NARASA REDDI:—"I second the motion."

The motion was put and carried.

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"I beg to introduce the Bill."

V.—THE MADRAS ALIYASANTANA BILL (MR. K. P. RAMAN MENON).

Mr. K. P. RAMAN MENON:—"I beg to move for leave to introduce the Madras Aliyasantana Bill."

Mr. M. S. SRESHTA:—"I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

Mr. K. P. RAMAN MENON:—"I introduce the Madras Aliyasantana Bill."

VI.—THE MADRAS ALIYASANTANA BILL (MR. A. B. SHETTY).

Mr. A. B. SHETTY:—"I beg to move for leave to introduce the Madras Aliyasantana Bill."

Mr. R. M. PALAT:—"I second it."

The motion was put and carried.

Mr. A. B. SHETTY:—"I introduce the Madras Aliyasantana Bill."

VII.—A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS ESTATES LAND ACT, 1908.

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"I move for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Madras Estates Land Act, 1908."

Mr. T. C. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"I second it."

4 p.m. * The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"Sir, in rising to propose an adjournment to the motion before the House, I wish to make the following statement on behalf of my Party with your permission. Hon. Members are aware that an official Bill to amend the Madras Estates Land Act was introduced in this Council by the hon. the Revenue Member on the 26th January 1932."

* Mr. V. T. ARASU:—"On a point of order, Mr. President, may I know whether the hon. the Chief Minister is at liberty to make a statement at this stage?"

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"In amplification of the motion that he is moving he is making a statement."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"May I know whether he is making a statement, or speaking in support of the motion that he has moved. That makes a lot of difference. If he is going to make only a statement under the Standing Order which contemplates the making of such a statement, he has only to make a short statement which may be replied."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"That short statement is being made."

1st August 1933]

* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"Is that so? So, he is not speaking in support of the adjournment motion that he has moved?"

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"As I have already said, in amplification of the motion that he is moving he is making a statement."

Mr. T. S. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"May I know if there is any convention, when an hon. Member seeks the leave of the House to introduce a Bill, that there should be no speech on a motion for adjournment?"

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I do not think that convention has been followed consistently in this House."

* The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"Hon. Members are aware that an official Bill to amend the Madras Estates Land Act was introduced in this Council by the hon. the Revenue Member on the 26th January 1932. In doing so, Sir Archibald Campbell had made it abundantly clear that the measure was intended to set right certain difficulties which have been found in the working of the Estates Land Act of 1908, and that it was not intended to confer any new rights or powers upon either the zamindars or the ryots. At that time, my hon. Friend, Diwan Bahadur Muniswami Nayudu Garu, stated as follows:—

'Sir, I propose to say a few words with regard to the Bill itself. Objection has been taken by persons interested in the ryots that the Bill does not go as far as it should, and that it is not comprehensive in any sense. The necessity for an amending Bill has been felt a very long time ago. It is stated that this is not the proper time to bring forward a Bill of this sort, that it may be left to the new Council which will be more popular and representative than it is now, and that this Bill should be withdrawn. I would only say that there are a very large number of outstanding questions in connexion with the Estates Land Act which concern the actual working of the Act and which concern the rights claimed by the tenants and by the landlords. There are others which are of a very controversial nature and I am sure that this House would not like that such questions should be taken up by the Government themselves either on behalf of the zamindars or on behalf of the tenants. Many such contentious points have been laid aside and this Bill is confined to those which may not be said to be very contentious but which would facilitate the proper working of the Act. The Bill is restricted to matters dealing mostly with procedure and which are non-contentious. . . . It would be open to the Select Committee to consider to what extent the interests of both the landlords and the tenants might be safeguarded and to see that nothing is done to jeopardise the interests of either the one or the other parties. The main purpose of the Bill is to clear up certain difficulties which are felt in regard to the working of the Act. I appeal therefore to the House and say that, in allowing this Bill to go before a Select Committee, they might see that all non-contentious questions are settled and that all contentious matters affecting either the landlords or the tenants are postponed.'

"The Bill was referred to a Select Committee and I am sure my hon. Friend, Mr. Muniswami Nayudu, would endorse my remarks when I state that both the representatives of the tenants and the zamindars in the Committee approached the problems in a spirit of good will and produced a report which was almost unanimous, but for a short dissenting minute by the Leader of the Opposition. The Bill, as modified by the Select Committee, was republished. At this stage, those who claim to represent the ryots put forward the view that no measure, seeking to amend the Estates Land Act could be brought forward during the lifetime of the present Council. While feeling that the proper adjustment of the relation between the zamindars and the ryot is

[The Raja of Bobbili]

[1st. August 1933]

essentially a domestic problem and that it was a mistake to suppose that the problem will solve itself by the establishment of Responsible Government in this country or by transfer of power from British to Indian hands, yet, the zamindari representatives, in the interests of amicable relationship, agreed to fall in with the view point of the tenants. Owing to this understanding the Madras Landholders' Association, which had drafted an amending Bill, decided to drop the matter.

"When the hon. the Revenue Member sought to move for the consideration of the Select Committee Report on the 30th January 1933, representations were made to Government from all the parties in the Council that earnest attempts should be made by both parties to come to an agreed settlement and that the consideration of the Government measure should be postponed. In accordance with this general desire, the hon. the Revenue Member did not proceed with the further stages of the Bill. But unfortunately contrary to all expectations at that time various attempts are being made to push forward non-official measures embodying the demands of the tenants. I beg to point out to this hon. House there are two parties to this question and I wish once more to appeal to both the leaders of the landholders and of the ryots and, in doing so, I cannot do better than quote the words of the hon. the Revenue Member when he presented the report of the Select Committee:—

"The prosperity of the landholders and the ryots are so inseparably intermingled that the welfare of the one depends upon the welfare of the other and that it is not possible for one party to carry out any measures which will materially affect the welfare of the other without affecting its own welfare. Their best interests will be served by mutual co-operation and good will. I am sure this will be appreciated by all parties of this House and will always be borne in mind."

"The main criticism against the official Bill is that from the ryots' point of view it does not go far enough. But I am afraid that such criticism is out of place as the objects and reasons of the Bill make it clear beyond any possibility of doubt that the scope of the Bill is limited to the removal of the difficulties found in the actual working of the Act of 1908. I can state, without fear of contradiction, that the Select Committee did not make any changes which were calculated to adversely affect the interests of the ryots. As a proof of their confidence that it is eminently desirable and possible to arrive at an agreed solution of this longstanding question, the representatives of the landholders have joined with those of the tenants in making a joint request to Government to postpone the consideration of the official Bill.

"In connexion with this legislation to amend the Madras Estates Land Act, I had some informal talks with a few representative landholders and certain representatives of the ryots in order to ascertain whether there is any reasonable prospect of an agreed measure being pushed through the Legislative Council which will safeguard the interests of the landholders as well as the ryots. I had a long discussion with Mr. Ramdas Pantulu who is the President of the Zamin Ryots' Association and I was assured by many of those whom I had thus consulted that it is possible to reconcile the claims of the landholders and the ryots to bring about an amicable settlement of the outstanding

1st August 1933]

[The Raja of Bobbili]

differences if an earnest endeavour is made in a spirit of give and take. The Justice Party has this unique advantage over other parties. It has always tried to reconcile and harmonize apparently conflicting interests. It is the one party that can claim among its ranks the rich and the poor alike, the capitalist and the labourer, the landlord and the tenant—all merging in one harmonious whole, all striving not for individual privilege, but for the privileges of the community at large, each willing and eager to sacrifice something of his own interest for the larger interests of the country. In harmonizing the interests of all sections and classes, in adjusting their apparently conflicting rights to the benefit of both and in the promotion of the common good lies not merely the work but also the strength of this party. I am sure it will be recognized that the main principle and object underlying the Estates Land Act is to safeguard the rights of the cultivating tenants. But what has been the result in the actual working of the Act? In actual practice the occupancy right has been passing into the hands of the middlemen whose only interest in the land is to extract the highest possible rent and the cultivating tenants are being reduced to the position of serfs. Surely this was not the intention of the framers of the original Act nor is this process in the interests of the masses. My party is certainly not in favour of creating a new class of intermediate landholders. In the Bill now sought to be introduced no attempt has been made to safeguard the rights of the cultivating tenants and to prevent lands passing from the hands of the agricultural classes. We believe that the time has now come to seriously consider the question of incorporating some of the provisions of the Punjab Land Alienation Act and ameliorate the sufferings of the tenants in whole inam villages.

“ In this connexion I may also state that all those to whom I have sent invitations have been kind enough to write to me approving my idea for a conference of representatives of both the interests to try and settle once for all the various longstanding questions concerning both the landlords and the tenants. I am also assured by Mr. Ramdas Pantulu who I believe drafted the Bill which is now sought to be introduced that if we are to go into these longstanding questions and settle them once and for all, it will be very difficult because the scope of the Bill is too narrow to permit of such a procedure. He has also suggested to me in the interests of both the parties if an earnest attempt is going to be made it is desirable that pending settlement of these questions the consideration of both the official and non-official Bills may be adjourned for a short time.

“ I believe I have now proved in a general way that the Bill of my hon. Friend, Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti, does not make any attempt to solve the real problem, viz., the safeguarding of the rights of the tillers of the soil who form the backbone of India. I therefore earnestly and sincerely appeal on behalf of my party to the sponsors of this measure not to proceed with it until the next meeting of the Council. So far as the zamindars are concerned, subject to the rights of private property they are prepared to go to the fullest extent to meet the view point of tenants.

[The Raja of Bobbili]

[1st August 1933]

“ Let us therefore proceed with the Conference which I have called for with the consent of both parties and settle once for all this long-standing and vexatious problem. Some differences there may be but the points of agreement are many and after my recent discussions with the representatives of the tenants and zamindars, I am fully confident that, given a spirit of good will on both sides we would be able to evolve an agreed solution with the help of God. To-day India is on the eve of great constitutional changes and it is necessary that we should tackle this problem with a view to a final solution. Both parties must be prepared to make sacrifices to come to an agreed solution by mutual consent. We will be thus doing the greatest service to our country at this critical juncture. I sincerely hope and trust that my appeal will meet with adequate response and appreciation.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—“ Will the hon. Minister read out his adjournment motion? ”

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—“ I beg to move—

that the consideration of this business be adjourned to the next meeting of the Council.” ”

Mr. K. R. VENKATARAMA AYYAR:—“ Mr. President, Sir, so far as I have been able to examine the Standing Orders governing a motion such as has been moved by my hon. Friend, Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti, I find that the Council has only two courses open to it: either it can give leave to the hon. Member to introduce his Bill or some Member of the House can oppose the motion asking for leave. There can be no intermediate course to which the House can resort. I understand that the suggestion in the long statement of the hon. the Chief Minister is an invitation in a spirit of goodwill to my hon. Friend, Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti, to defer making his motion for the present or to withdraw the motion he has made and take the assurance given by the hon. the Chief Minister in the spirit in which he has given it. Of course, it is for him to accept that suggestion or not. If he does not, the House has to treat the Chief Minister's motion as one of opposition to Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti's motion or else to ignore it altogether.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—“ I do not think the hon. Member is correct in his interpretation of the Standing Orders. Standing Order No. 33 clearly lays down that—

A motion that any meeting or business be adjourned or postponed or that the Council pass to the business next in order in the statement of business may be moved at any time and without previous notice. . .

“ Now there is a business pending before the House and that is the motion of Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti for leave to introduce a certain Bill. In reply to that the hon. the Raja of Bobbili is entitled to move a distinct motion for the adjournment of that particular business.”

* Mr. YAKUB HASAN:—“ Mr. President, Sir, it would have been a more straightforward course if the hon. the Chief Minister had opposed the motion for leave to introduce the Bill. On the other hand, he has

1st August 1933]

[Mr. Yakub Hasan]

asked the Mover, Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti, to postpone his motion to the next meeting and informed the House that he and his party are now engaged in preparing a Bill which they would bring before the House and that they are trying to arrive at a compromise which will be acceptable to all the parties concerned. But what I want to ask is this: why should it be thought that what the hon. the Raja of Bobbili intends to do, cannot be achieved equally well by Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti? At present, we have not got the Bill of Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti before us and he has only asked us for leave to introduce a certain Bill. When the Bill actually comes before the House we can judge whether it will be acceptable to all the parties concerned or not and whether Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti has been successful in arriving at a compromise satisfactory to all the parties. Why should not Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti, a member of the Nationalist Party, be allowed to bring in a Bill and be given all the necessary facilities to shape it in such a way that it will be acceptable to all concerned? Why should the hon. the Chief Minister think that he and his party alone should have the privilege and the credit of bringing forward a Bill of this sort? I think, in a matter of this kind, a non-official Member will be in a better position to bring forward a Bill acceptable to all parties than the party in power. It has been said that attempts were made and they were not successful. Therefore, why should the Government repeat those attempts? Let them allow a non-official Member like Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti to introduce a Bill and let the hon. the Chief Minister put into action the spirit that has animated his statement by giving his help and the help of his party to Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti to shape the Bill in proper form. Finally I appeal to the House to give leave to Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti to introduce the Bill and not be carried away by the statement read out to us by the hon. the Chief Minister."

* Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"Mr. President, on behalf of the ryots, let me express my thanks to the hon. the Raja of Bobbili for the gesture he has made in promising to try to introduce as early as possible a Bill which will be acceptable both to the landlords and the tenants. I take it that he is sincere also in the invitation he has issued for a conference. I was unfortunately not able to attend the first meeting of the Conference, for which I express my regret and I promised my full co-operation in the further stages of the Conference. At the same time, we should have to take note of the way in which we have to conduct our business in this House. Sir, the chances of a private Member pushing forward a private Bill to a conclusion are very slender. It will be remembered that when the Government introduced a Bill on this question, the objection raised on behalf of the tenants was that the Bill was not sufficiently comprehensive and therefore ought not to be allowed to go forward and that the Government should be asked to introduce a more comprehensive measure. The hon. Raja Saheb referred to my speech on that occasion in which I appealed to the House to allow the Bill to go forward on the ground that it sought to correct certain glaring defects which had to be corrected

[Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu] [1st August 1933]

immediately and that it avoided as far as possible controversial matters which were reserved to a more appropriate occasion. That suggestion was made by me at a time, when in the usual course of things it was expected that the term of the Legislative Council would expire at the end of the year and that a new Council under a new Constitution would come into existence very soon and that that new Council would be representative of the people much more than the present Council. In fact, when the Select Committee made its report and when the question of presenting the report of the Select Committee to the House and asking it to take the Bill into consideration came up, it was felt that the whole question might well be taken up in a comprehensive measure and even then the feeling was that by the end of the year, this Council would cease to exist. But now, it is clear from what is taking place elsewhere, that this Council may continue for two years at least, if not for more. Therefore the possibility of this question being tackled to the satisfaction of any party, be it the Government or to the landlords represented by the Raja Saheb or the tenants whoever he may consider to be their representative—the chances of such a Bill being introduced as early as possible are remote. It is in these circumstances that my hon. Friend Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti has asked for leave to introduce a Bill which has been drafted on behalf of the tenants. On the eve of the introduction of the Bill the Raja Saheb has called for a conference. I am sure he will agree with me that given the best will in the world, it will take some time before we are able to devise a measure which will be acceptable to both the parties. If, therefore, the Conference proves fruitful of results, it is good. On our part we will do nothing which will hamper any further steps that the Raja Saheb may take, especially in view of the gesture he has shown to-day. If, on the other hand, the conference proves unsuccessful, I equally appeal to him to translate into action the spirit of the gesture he has shown and assure us that he as one of the Members of the Government will give us a chance, will do his best to see that our Bill is pushed through so that it may be placed on the statute book during the lifetime of this Council. If the Bill is given leave now, it will take two months more before we can introduce it and have the first reading taken up and then if necessary refer it to a select committee. Two months' period is a sufficiently long time within which to gauge the opinion of the parties on both sides. If by the next meeting of the Council we go a fairly long way to reach a compromise, I on behalf of my hon. Friend, Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti will give an assurance that we will not proceed with the further stages of the Bill. But if, for any reason, we are able to agree, then, I am sure the Raja Saheb will agree with me that though he might have the power as a Member of the Government to stifle the further progress of the Bill, he should give a case to the private Bill to go forward. He should not oppose the motion asking for leave to introduce the Bill, because there will be time enough for him—may God forbid that—to oppose the Bill during its further stages having regard to the proceedings of the Conference. Under these circumstances, may I appeal to him in the same spirit which has animated his gesture to allow us merely to take leave of the House to introduce

1st August 1933]

[B. Muniswami Nayudu]

the Bill on the understanding that the further progress of the Bill would depend on the extent to which at the Conference that is proposed to be called we are able to come to an agreement. The Raja Saheb has said that he is anxious not merely on behalf of the landlords whom he represents, but also on behalf of his Party to settle this question. Sir, on behalf of the tenants I am willing to give an assurance that we do not in any way cavil at the position of the landlords. For the first time, he has thrown out a suggestion that what he is more anxious about is to secure occupancy rights to the actual cultivators of the land and not to allow middlemen to come in and take away the land. It is a very laudable object, no doubt, but to what extent he will be able to give effect to it is a question which will have to be decided at the Conference. If we are able to produce an agreed Bill it will be satisfactory to all. If it is not possible, then, Sir, we claim we should be shown the mere courtesy of having our Bill discussed and we are prepared to take our chance. I want to say nothing more than this. I have only one more observation to make before I sit down. It seems to me that in the matter of agrarian disputes, any Conference convened at the instance of the Government and composed of the representatives of the landlords and the tenants with the Government holding the scales evenly between them, would be productive of more satisfactory results than a conference called at the instance of one party which is admittedly the stronger party. However, I am prepared to co-operate with the Raja Saheb in his attempts to tackle this question. I also appeal to him in the same spirit in which he has appealed to us, that so far as this Bill is concerned he would give us a chance to take leave of the Council to introduce it, so that if further stages become necessary we might go through those further stages during the lifetime of the Council. These are the few remarks I have to submit and I wish that all the professions of the party opposite may be put into practice."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"Sir, after hearing the appeal made by the hon. the Raja of Bobbili this afternoon asking me to suspend the consideration of this business till the next meeting of the Council, I am considerably handicapped in this matter. I thought that it has been a longstanding convention that no non-official Bill should be opposed at the very first stage. I take it that the hon. the Raja of Bobbili appreciates that convention by the very fact that, without directly opposing the motion for leave to introduce, he has thought it fit to circumvent that convention by a very novel method of asking for the adjournment of the consideration of this business to the next meeting. But I dare say that he will agree with me that the effect of his motion will be the same. Knowing as he does that he has a big party and Government Officers on his side, is it not a strange appeal that he has made to me? The appeal he has made to me is practically one method of coercion; 'if you do not respond to my appeal, I am going to use my party strength and the strength of the Government with whom I am associated at present, to oppose the motion.' In these circumstances it would appear that the appeal made to me is not an appeal (except the word that is used); it is actually an order to me to suspend

4-30
p.m.

[Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti] [1st August 1933]

the consideration of this motion. Having regard to that kind of attitude which the hon. the Raja of Bobbili has thought fit to adopt, does it promise that the Conference which he proposes to hold in order to arrive at an agreement on the various points at issue between the landlords and the tenants would achieve good results? In these circumstances I am afraid that it would be very difficult for the parties to come to a common understanding.

“ With regard to the various stages of a Bill on this subject, which the hon. the Raja of Bobbili enumerated to the Council, may I remind the Council that the Bill which I now propose to introduce is not new to this Council? Mr. Satyanarayana Choudari representing the Guntur constituency, had once taken permission of the Council to introduce this very Bill after obtaining the sanction of His Excellency the Governor-General. By the time the Bill was ripe for the second stage and for being referred to the Select Committee, the policy of the Government to appoint lawyer Members of this Council to public prosecutorship came into play and my friend, Mr. Satyanarayana Choudari, was made a public prosecutor and consequently he lost his seat. It was by mere accident that Mr. Satyanarayana Choudari was disabled from pursuing the next stage with regard to this Bill. Otherwise, the Bill should have been on the anvil or should have been rejected on the merits of the Bill. Therefore this Bill is not new as the hon. the Raja of Bobbili appears to put it. Therefore, there is absolutely no reason to fear that the introduction of this Bill is going to nullify the attempts made to come to a settlement with regard to the various matters concerning the zamindars and ryots, by the representatives of both parties.

“ Secondly, my hon. Friend, the Raja of Bobbili, referred to the small conference which he convened at his bungalow to consider this matter. I was one of those who were invited to be present. When this matter was placed before me, I made an appeal to the hon. the Raja of Bobbili not to oppose the introduction of the Bill in contravention of a long-established convention and I made a promise that I would not proceed with the next stages of the Bill until I am satisfied that the conference which he proposes to convene becomes infructuous or is not convened at all. I take it that any hon. Gentleman, who is reasonably disposed to see that the interests of the zamindars and tenants should be put on a satisfactory footing, should have been satisfied with such an assurance of mine. Taking leave for the introduction of this Bill is not going to affect the attempts which the hon. the Raja of Bobbili will be making in furtherance of the interests of the zamindars and the ryots. The hon. Member referred to some letters which he has received from the Leaders of Parties in this Council. What my hon. Friend, Mr. Muniswami Nayudu said—with which I entirely agree—is that we would co-operate with the hon. the Raja of Bobbili in the conference which he proposes to hold to come to an agreement and to introduce a comprehensive Bill. Mr. Ramadass Pantulu who is the President of the Zamin Ryots Association has written a very long letter to the hon. the Raja of Bobbili, that he would await the settlements that will be

1st August 1933] [Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti]

arrived at by means of the conference. In that letter he also speaks of the possibility of three Bills being referred to the same Select Committee, my Bill, the Government Bill, and the Bill which would be drafted as a result of the deliberations of the proposed conference. It does not disallow the prospect of this Bill going through the second stage. The hon. the Raja of Bobbili has referred to the opinions of those who are not in this Council now. My hon. Friend, Mr. Muniswami Nayudu, gave us the reasons why we agreed to put off the consideration of the Government Bill. That was done as a result of some understanding come to between the leaders of some parties and the Government then. We thought that the prospect of the new Council would be nearer. Moreover there was agitation both on behalf of the zamindars and of the tenants, as to the progress of the Bill.

“The hon. the Raja of Bobbili prides himself of the fact that his party consists of landlords and tenants, capitalists and labourites, rich and poor, and of all communities, except the Brahman. If his party supports the motion made by the hon. the Raja of Bobbili for adjourning the consideration of this business, it is not because the members of his party fully approve of this action. I am afraid there is something very doubtful and suspicious about the position of the party. Does it require to be stated publicly that such a strong party would be used to break the convention that the first stages of a private Member's Bill should not be opposed? I feel that there is heart-burning in that party. If not, may I ask the hon. Members of that party representing the tenants to come out and say whether they are supporting the motion of the hon. the Raja of Bobbili, whole-heartedly? If they support the motion, it is not because they are convinced of the reasonableness of the motion, but because of party discipline. I have got great regard for those who follow party discipline; I admire greatly the loyalty of the men of the party to their leader. But it is not so in this case; the real state of their mind is quite different. As members of the party, they are bound to obey the mandate of the party. In this case, the hon. the Raja of Bobbili has taken undue advantage of the loyalty of the members of his party, who are bound by party discipline.

“Of course it is not my intention to place any impediment in the way of sincere attempts being made to effect a compromise. If he can tell me in what way I can possibly accommodate him in the matter of expediting the conference being held, I shall certainly be glad to do so. But the motion before the House for leave to introduce the Bill should not be opposed. His opposition to my motion would mean that he wants to put off this matter to as distant a date as possible. The next meeting of the Council being in October, he knows perfectly well that any conference however expeditiously its business may be conducted, will not be able to produce a comprehensive Bill before that time. In that case there is no chance for any Bill being brought forward before next August, as in the months of February and March we would be fully engaged with the Budget. The party of the hon. the Raja of Bobbili is not the only party to be consulted in this matter. There is a third party, the Government; we do not know whether they are in

[Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti] [1st August 1933]

agreement with the hon. the Raja of Bobbili; we do not know what their attitude is. To-morrow it may be said 'the Raja of Bobbili may have given the assurance; we did not give any such assurance; what right have you to go on with this Bill?' The hon. the Raja of Bobbili may resile from his position by throwing the blame on the Government. Having regard to all these considerations, I appeal to the hon. the Chief Minister not to introduce this novel procedure of adjourning the consideration of this Bill and of opposing the motion for leave to introduce a Bill by a non-official member. I have of course promised him that I shall not proceed with the next stage of the Bill until I know definitely the results of the attempts that will be made by him to come to an agreement.

"Considerations of health prevent me from dragging on this question till to-morrow. My hon. Friend, the hon. the Raja of Bobbili, referred to some of the provisions of the Bill. It is true that all questions which affect the interests of both the parties have not been adequately tackled in the Bill of which I have given notice. I confess, Sir, that I am ignorant of many things which affect the landlord and the tenant. I consider that that is a good reason why my Bill should be allowed to go forward, because there is a third party—a neutral man—who can possibly help both the landlord and the tenant to compose their differences. I beg the hon. the Raja of Bobbili to have regard for a convention which has been long established. If he is going to break this convention, this kind of game can be played by both the parties. We can also play the same game and obstruct even the first stages of any Bill given notice of by an hon. Member on the other side of the House. Conventions are made to be observed by all parties. The convention should not be followed so far as one party is benefited by it and it should not be given the go-by when it is to the advantage of the other party. The hon. the Raja of Bobbili should not say, 'convention or no convention, I will use my strength against the motion'; because, conventions are established to keep the balance against strength. Otherwise there need not be any convention at all; it will be a majority rule. Any non-official member will be in the same position if the Government are going to stand in the way of the first stages of a Bill.

4-45
p.m.

"I do not want to import into this discussion anything relating to public opinion in regard to this matter; but it is necessary for me to say to the hon. the Raja of Bobbili that those who are sitting there in that gallery as the representatives of the tenants are now watching the progress of this Bill. They are very keen about seeing that this is settled once for all and it is wrong to say that the tenants are unwilling to co-operate. They are willing to accommodate in respect of all reasonable claims of the zamindars; they only want that their grievances should be looked into carefully and adjusted. After all, all the parties will have to face the electorate sooner or later. In the interests of your own party, may I suggest that it would be far better to grapple these things in this Council itself rather than leave it to a new Council. Whatever might be the optimism with which the hon. the Raja of

1st August 1933] [Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti]

Bobbili is surcharged to-day, I cannot be so sure of the strength of his party after the next election, having regard to the way in which his party is at present composed—i.e., composed of landlords and tenants, capitalists and labourites, rich and poor. I would warn the tenants who are pinning their faith upon the reasonableness of the zamindars. If the zamindar Ministers who represent the so-called popular party, are unable to respond to an appeal made by me, where is the chance of the reasonable appeals of the tenants being responded to by the zamindars?"

Sriman M. G. PATNAICK Mahasayo:—"Of course, Sir, I do not agree with all that my Friend Mr. Venkatachalam Chetti has said. There is nothing sinister in what the hon. the Raja Sahib has stated. I think he is quite serious in trying to effect a compromise. Of course it is all a question merely of *jith*. If the hon. Raja Sahib wants that no leave should be granted for this Bill now, he will probably have his wish fulfilled, with the support of the members of his own party. If the other side wants that leave should be granted, then naturally the controversy comes. Mr. Venkatachalam Chettiyar is quite aware of the fact that he cannot proceed with the further stages of the Bill without the co-operation of the other parties in the House. The Raja Sahib's party is a strong party, and therefore he can at any time use that strength against the other party. The Raja Sahib wants to do something really good to both the landholders and the ryots. Therefore I appeal to him to be magnanimous enough to grant the request of my hon. Friend, Mr. Venkatachalam Chetti, that leave be granted to his Bill. Let him not insist upon *jith*."

* Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR:—"Mr. President, I do not want to give my silent vote on this very important question. I think nobody can appropriate to himself the claim to defend the rights of the tenants in this House, because most of us here are tenants ourselves. I am a tenant of zamin and Government lands. So, I am as much interested as the Opposition or the Justice Party in seeing that the rights of the tenants are preserved. I do not want to give a silent vote on this matter, though of course, I may have to vote with the Justice Party. I am foremost in fighting for the cause of the tenants, because I am a tenant myself in a zamindari land where I am suffering, and I am a tenant in Government land where too I am suffering. We all know that Bills after Bills were introduced in this Council. There was recently a Bill introduced by the Government, which was sought to be amended by the hon. the Revenue Member. All the parties went to him and said 'Do not do it because we are not satisfied with the contents of that Bill.' I may assure the Council that the Raja Sahib was the foremost to see that that Bill was not allowed to enter this House last time. I admired him when he said that when the parties were against it, he won't allow the Bill to proceed. He himself was one of those who were against the introduction of the Bill by the hon. the Revenue Member. Now the Chief Minister says: 'I have called for a conference; the conference has already met; and in that con-

[Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar] [1st August 1933]

ference, the representative of the zamin ryots says "I agree to your proposals; let there be some conciliation made between the zamindars and the ryots; let us bring up a consolidated Bill which would be acceptable to both the zamindars and the ryots." I am glad that Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chettiyar takes so much interest in the ryots; though we are all living in towns, we have got lands in Chingieput district or somewhere near; we are living in a place where people do not know how rice is produced, whether it is from tree, etc. We know that if a private Bill is brought up here, the zamindars or others might do something as a result of which enough of privileges will not be given to the ryots. I myself intended to bring forward in this Council a Tenants' Protection Bill, but the then Law Member, the late Sir K. Srinivasa Ayyangar said: 'Don't do that.' He said: 'If you bring in a private Bill, you may not succeed so well as I will succeed with a Government Bill.' So said the late Sir Moir too. Now the Raja Sahib is taking Sir K. Srinivasa Ayyangar's line of reply, and says: 'My Friend Mr. Venkatachalam Chettiyar, don't do that. I will bring in a Bill and I shall satisfy the House. The zamindars will come down to please the tenants.' My Friend Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chettiyar's bill may not include all the provisions that the tenants require now; and even if it does, those provisions may be thrown out by the other side. I would therefore request Mr. Chettiyar in the interests of the people whom he and I both represent, to drop this Bill now and wait for a month. If the Raja Sahib does not bring in his own Bill before then, we will all of us then join together and see that our friend's Bill is passed. I think more rights can be secured for the tenants by a Bill brought forward by the Raja Sahib. Already Mr. Ramdas Pantulu has said that any Bill contemplated or suggested by us will not even get the minimum privileges for the tenants. So, let us all wait for the Raja Sahib's Bill and support it. But if he does not bring it within one month, then we will support Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chettiyar's Bill. I request Mr. Chettiyar to postpone the introduction of this Bill for a month.

"So far as the Justice Party is concerned, we have always stood for all the communities and for all classes. Ours is a religio-socio body, political and aristo-democratic party. If Mr. Muniswami Nayudu is to-day the leader of a party, it is of the Justice Democratic Party. If Dr. Subbarayan is to-day the leader of a party, it is of the Justice Nationalist Party (Laughter). So, all parties in the House belong to the Justice party. We can unite at any time we like; and so long as there are no obstructionists here, there is no new party. All belong to the same party. The Raja Sahib wants to safeguard the interests of all parties."

MR. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"On a point of order, Mr. President. According to Standing Order No. 36, if a motion for leave to introduce is opposed, the President, after permitting a brief explanatory statement from the member who opposes the motion, may without further debate allow the question to be put."

1st August 1933]

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I am afraid the hon. Member woke up rather too late. I have already said that Standing Order does not apply to this particular motion."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"But this comes under 'legislation'."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Dr. Natesa Mudaliyar may continue his speech."

* Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR:—"I was saying that all of us belong to the same party and hold the same political views, although we sit on opposite benches. Of course there may be some small differences, but as a party, the Justice party has revolutionized the whole presidency by its creed. Anybody who safeguards the interests of his own community is a Justice party man; and so, Mr. Chettiyaar is also a Justice party man as he spoke of safeguarding the interests of his community some time ago. My suggestion therefore is that we must all join together to bring forward a consolidated Bill. Let us wait for a month and we shall have a consolidated Bill which will be in the interests of the tenants and give them more privileges."

Mr. M. A. MUTHIAH CHETTIYAR:—"I move, Sir, that the question be now put."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The question is that the question 5 p.m. be now put."

The closure motion was put and declared lost.

A poll was demanded by Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chettiyaar, and the House divided thus:

Ayes.

1 The hon. Sir Mahomed Usman.	25 Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur.
2 " Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar.	26 Rao Sahib V. I. Muniswami Pillai.
3 " Sir Archibald Campbell.	27 Mr. M. Vedachala Mudaliyar.
4 " Mr. H. G. Stokes.	28 " B. P. Sesha Reddi.
5 " Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar.	29 " P. C. Moses.
6 " Mr. P. T. Rajan.	30 " P. V. Rajagopal Pillai.
7 " the Raja of Bobbili.	31 " P. Bayappa Reddi.
8 Rao Bahadur G. Jagannadha Raju.	32 Khan Bahadur T. M. Moidoo Sahib Bahadur.
9 Mrs. K. Alamelumangathayaramma.	33 Mr. G. Lakshmana Reddi.
10 Mr. C. E. Jones.	34 Rao Sahib V. Dharmalingam Pillai.
11 " J. A. Thorne.	35 Zamindar of Mirzapuram.
12 " H. M. Hood.	36 " Bodinayakkanur.
13 " R. Madanagopal Nayudu.	37 Mr. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyaar.
14 " E. Conran Smith.	38 " A. V. Bhanoji Rao.
15 " T. Sundararao Nayudu.	39 " Daniel Thomas.
16 Khan Sahib Syed Tajuddin Sahib Bahadur.	40 Swami A. S. Sahajanandam.
17 Mr. M. D. T. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.	41 Mr. H. M. Jagannatham.
18 " V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar.	42 Rao Sahib P. Subrahmanyam Chetti.
19 Rao Bahadur A. T. Pannirselvam.	43 Rao Bahadur V. N. Viswanatha Rao.
20 Mr. K. C. M. Venkatachala Reddiyar.	44 Diwan Bahadur A. Appadurai Pillai.
21 " G. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.	45 Rao Sahib D. V. Narasimhaswami.
22 Rao Bahadur R. Srinivasan.	46 Pandit Ganala Ramamurti.
23 Mr. M. Devadasan.	47 Mr. A. Harischandrudu.
24 Rao Sahib N. Siva Raj.	48 " K. Kesavaramamurti.
	49 " S. M. K. Beyabani Sahib.
	50 " G. Simhachalam Pantulu.
	51 Rao Bahadur C. Natesa Mudaliyar.

[1st August 1933]

Ayes—cont.

- 52 Mr. C. Basu Dev.
 53 „ F. Birley.
 54 „ W. O. Wright.
 55 „ W. K. M. Langley.

- 56 Mr. W. W. Ladden.
 57 „ R. M. Palat.
 58 „ F. J. Stanes.

Noes.

- 1 Dr. P. Subbarayan.
 2 Mr. Yakub Hasan.
 3 „ K. R. Venkatarama Ayyar.
 4 „ T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
 5 „ Sami Venkatachalam Chetti.
 6 „ T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar.
 7 „ V. T. Arasu.
 8 Khan Bahadur P. Khalif-ul-lah
 Sahib Bahadur.
 9 Mr. A. B. Shetty.
 10 „ Abdul Hameed Khan.
 11 „ Basheer Ahmed Sayeed.
 12 „ P. Peddiraju.
 13 „ Ahmed Meeran.

- 14 Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder.
 15 Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami
 Nayudu.
 16 Mr. K. P. Raman Menon.
 17 „ G. R. Premayya.
 18 Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo.
 19 Mr. C. Indriah.
 20 „ J. Kuppuswami.
 21 „ Mahboob Ali Baig.
 22 „ P. V. Krishnayya.
 23 „ M. B. Rangaswami Reddi.
 24 „ G. Sriramulu.
 25 Rao Bahadur R. K. Venugopal
 Nayudu.

Ayes 58. Noes 25.

The motion was carried.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I will now put the hon. the Raja of Bobbili's motion to the vote of the House.

"The question is that the consideration of this business be adjourned to the next meeting of the Council."

The motion was put to the House and declared carried.

A poll was demanded, and the House divided thus:

Ayes.

- 1 The hon. Sir Mahomed Usman.
 2 „ Diwan Bahadur Sir M.
 Krishnan Navar.
 3 „ Sir Archibald Campbell.
 4 „ Mr. H. G. Stokes.
 5 „ Diwan Bahadur S. Kuma-
 raswami Reddiyar.
 6 „ Mr. P. T. Rajan.
 7 „ The Raja of Bobbili.
 8 Rao Bahadur G. Jagannadha Raju.
 9 Mrs. K. Alamelumangathayaramma.
 10 Mr. C. E. Jones.
 11 „ J. A. Thorne.
 12 „ H. M. Hood.
 13 „ R. Madanagopal Nayudu.
 14 „ E. Conran Smith.
 15 „ T. Sundararao Nayudu.
 16 Khan Sahib Syed Tajuddin Sahib
 Bahadur.
 17 Mr. M. D. T. Ranganatha Mudali-
 yar.
 18 Rao Bahadur A. T. Pannirselvam.
 19 Mr. K. C. M. Venkatachala Reddi-
 yar.
 20 „ G. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
 21 Rao Bahadur R. Srinivasan.
 22 Mr. M. Devadasan.

- 23 Rao Sahib N. Siva Raj.
 24 Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa
 Bahadur.
 25 Rao Sahib V. I. Muniswami Pillai.
 26 Mr. M. Vedachala Mudaliyar.
 27 „ B. P. Sessa Reddi.
 28 „ P. C. Moses.
 29 „ P. V. Rajagopal Pillai.
 30 „ P. Bayappa Reddi.
 31 Khan Bahadur T. M. Moidoo Sahib
 Bahadur.
 32 Mr. G. Lakshmana Reddi.
 33 Rao Sahib V. Dharmalingam Pillai.
 34 Rao Bahadur V. N. Viswanatha Roa.
 35 Zamindar of Mirzapuram.
 36 „ Bodinayakkanur.
 37 Mr. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar.
 38 „ A. V. Bhanoji Rao.
 39 „ Daniel Thomas.
 40 Swami A. S. Sahajanandam.
 41 Mr. H. M. Jagannatham.
 42 Rao Sahib P. Subrahmanyam Chetti.
 43 Diwan Bahadur A. Appadurai Pillai.
 44 Rao Sahib D. V. Narasimhaswami.
 45 Rao Sahib Pandit Ganala Rama-
 murti.

1st August 1933]

Ayes—cont.

46 Mr. A. Harischandrudu.	52 Mr. C. Basu Dev.
47 „ K. Kesavaramamurti.	53 „ F. Birley.
48 „ S. M. K. Beyabani.	54 „ W. O. Wright.
49 „ G. Simhachalam.	55 „ R. Foulkes.
50 „ R. M. Palat.	56 „ W. K. M. Langley.
51 Rao Bahadur C. Natesa Mudaliyar.	57 „ W. W. Ladden.

Noes.

1 Dr. P. Subbarayan.	14 Mr. Ahmed Meeran.
2 Mr. Yakub Hasan.	15 „ K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder.
3 „ K. R. Venkatarama Ayyar.	16 Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu.
4 „ T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar.	17 Mr. K. P. Raman Menon.
5 „ Sami Venkatachalam Chetti.	18 „ G. R. Premayya.
6 Khan Bahadur Mahmud Schamnad Sahib Bahadur.	19 Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo.
7 Mr. T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar.	20 Mr. C. Indriah.
8 „ V. T. Arasu.	21 „ J. Kuppuswami.
9 Khan Bahadur P. Khalif-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur.	22 „ Mahboob Ali Baig.
10 Mr. A. B. Shetty.	23 „ P. V. Krishnayya Choudari.
11 „ Abdul Hameed Khan.	24 „ M. B. Rangaswami Reddi.
12 „ Basheer Ahmed Sayeed.	25 „ G. Sriramulu.
13 „ P. Peddiraju.	26 Rao Bahadur R. K. Venugopal Nayudu.

Ayes 57. Noes 26.

The motion was carried.

The House then adjourned to meet again at 11 a.m. the next day.

VIII.—PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE.

* 1. G.O. No. 680, *Development*, dated 7th June 1933, recording the audit report of the Government Industrial Institute, Madura, for the year ending 31st March 1932.

† 2. G.O. No. 2864, *L. & M.*, dated 17th July 1933, fixing the date of retirement of members of certain panchayats.

* 3. Statement showing additions and reductions in non-voted appropriations sanctioned during the year 1933.

R. V. KRISHNA AYYAR,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.

* Printed separately.

† Published in the Fort St. George Gazette.